

2



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/808,263 | 03/14/2001 | Peter H. Golde | 777.414US1 | 3366 |

7590 12/11/2003

STEVEN J. ROCCI
 WOODCOCK WASHBURN KURTZ
 MACKIEWICZ & NORRIS LLP
 ONE LIBERTY PLACE -46TH FLOOR
 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

HOANG, PHUONG N

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2126

DATE MAILED: 12/11/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

OK

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/808,263

Applicant(s)

GOLDE ET AL.

Examiner

Phuong N. Hoang

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 87 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 87 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 – 7, 12 - 14, 16 – 30, 35 – 37, 39 – 46, 51 – 53, 55 – 62, 67 – 69, 71 – 78, 83 – 85, 87, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brumme, US patent no. 6,134,559.

As to claim 1, Brumme teaches a method for operating a computer using object-based computer code, the method comprising:

invoking an event handler (event handler, col. 14 lines 48 – 57) method by calling another method of an instance of a class (objects respond to event by calling related methods, col. 15 lines 28 – 30 and col. 14 lines 48 – 57) calling related method for which parameters (event is passed via parameters, col. 15 lines 1 – 5) passed to the other method are also passed to the event handler method, a parameter list (signature include a parameter list, col. 14 lines 66 – col. 15 lines 10) of the other method having a same signature as a parameter list of the event handler method (inherits when the object is derived, col. 7 lines 25 – 45, and col. 12 lines 55 - 60), wherein the other method references the event handler method;

creating an invocation list associated with the other method, the invocation list

Art Unit: 2126

specifying one or more event handler methods to be invoked (source objects package information into a package that represents information common to all events, col. 15 lines 1 – 15); and

dynamically altering contents of the invocation list (event signatures may be dynamically added at run time, col. 15 lines 35 – 40).

As to claim 2 - 4, Brumme teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising adding an event handler method to the invocation list during execution of the object-based computer code (event signatures may be dynamically added at run time, col. 15 lines 35 – 40).

As to claim 5 - 7, Brumme teaches the method of claim 1, comprising removing an event handler from the invocation list during execution of the object-based computer code (removing elements of that collection, col. 13 lines 40 – 62).

As to claim 12, Brumme teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the event handler method is configured to handle an override event having a signature (passing methods from a parent or base type to one or more child or derived types signatures, col. 1 lines 45 – 60).

As to claim 13, Brumme teaches the method of claim 12, further comprising identifying an accessible event having a same signature as the override event (inherits when the object is derived, col. 7 lines 25 – 45, and col. 12 lines 55 - 60).

As to claim 14, Brumme teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the event handler method is configured to handle an abstract event (object systems may include abstract classes, col. 7 lines 40 – 45).

As to claim 16, Brumme teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the parameters passed to the other method to the event handler method comprise:

a sender parameter identifying an event source (source object, col. 14 lines 66 - col. 15 lines 15);

an event arguments parameter identifying one or more event arguments (arguments may be passed as extra parameters, col. 15 lines 1 – 10).

As to claim 17, see claims 1 and 16 above.

As to claims 18 – 23, see claims 2 – 7 above.

As to claim 24, this is the software claim of claim 1. See claim 1 above except for event source. Brumme teaches event source module configured to issue an event (an object that raises an event is called source object, col. 14 lines 66 -col. 15 lines 15).

As to claims 25 – 30, see claims 2 – 7 above.

As to claims 35 – 37, see claims 12 – 14 above.

As to claim 39, see claim 16 above.

As to claim 40, 56, see claim 24 above.

As to claims 41 – 46, 57 - 62, see claims 25 – 30 above.

As to claims 51 – 53, 67 - 69, see claims 35 – 37 above.

As to claim 55, 71, see claim 39 above.

As to claim 72, this is the system claim of claim 1. See claim 1 above for rejection.

As to claims 73 – 78, see claims 2 – 7 above.

As to claims 83 – 85, see claims 12 – 14 above.

As to claim 87, see claim 16 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8 – 11, 31 – 34, 47 - 49, 50, 63 – 66, 79 - 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brumme, US patent no. 6,134,559 in view of Wold, US patent no. 5,724,589.

As to claim 8, 9, 31, 32, 47, 48, 63, 64, 79 - 80, Brumme does not teach the method of claim 1, wherein the event handler method is configured to handle a static event.

Wold teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the event handler method is configured to handle a static event (static member function, fig. 5, col. 8 lines 35 – 67).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Wold to Brumme's system because it can run in different environment.

As to claim 10, 33, 49, 65, 81, Brumme does not teach the method of claim 1, wherein the event handler method is configured to handle a virtual event.

Wold teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the event handler method is configured to handle a virtual event (virtual member function, fig. 5, col. 8 lines 35 – 67).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Wold to Brumme's system because it can run in different environment.

As to claim 11, 34, 50, 66, 82, Brumme does not teach the method of claim 10, further comprising overriding the virtual event.

Wold teaches the method of claim 10, comprising overriding (derived, col. 3 lines 12 – 15 and col. 8 lines 35 – 67) the virtual event.

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Wold to Brumme's system because it can run in different environment.

Claims 15, 38, 54, 70, 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brumme, US patent no. 6,134,559 in view of Kimura, US patent no. 6,292,849.

As to claim 15, 38, 54, 70, 86, Brumme does not teach the method of claim 1, wherein the event handler is configured to handle an interface event.

Kimura teaches interface event (event interface, col. 14 lines 32 – 35).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Kimura to Brumme's system because the events also execute to control the interface.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong N. Hoang whose telephone number is (703) 605-4239. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)746-7140.

Ph

November 28, 2003



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100